arXiv:1209.5052v1 [cs.DS] 23 Sep 2012

Testing Small Set Expansion in General Graphs

Angsheng Li[*]
Chinese Academy of Sciences

Pan Peng[†]
Chinese Academy of Sciences

Abstract

We consider the problem of *testing small set expansion in general graphs*. A graph G is a (k, ϕ)-expander if every subset of volume at most k has conductance at least ϕ. Small set expansion has recently received significant attention due to its close connection to the unique games conjecture and the local graph partitioning algorithms.

We give a one-sided error tester that takes as input an n-vertex graph G, a volume bound k, an expansion bound ϕ and a distance parameter $\epsilon > 0$. The tester accepts the graph if it is a (k, ϕ)-expander and rejects it with high probability if it is ϵ-far from any (k^*, ϕ^*)-expander, where $k^* = \Theta(k^{1-\xi})$ and $\phi^* = \Theta(\xi\phi^2)$ for any $0 < \xi < 1/2$. Furthermore, whenever the tester rejects a graph it outputs a certificate to the fact that G is not a (k, ϕ)-expander in form of a subset with volume at most k and conductance less than ϕ. The running time of the tester is $O(\frac{k \ln^5 k}{\epsilon\phi^6})$, which is sublinear in n for $k = O(\frac{n}{\log^{\Omega(1)} n})$. Our methods combine the newly developed analysis techniques of lazy random walks for local graph partitioning algorithms and techniques for testing expansion in general graphs.

1 Introduction

Graph property testing is one of the most effective algorithmic paradigms to process real-world networks, the scale of which has become so large that it is even impractical to read the whole input. In the setting of testing a graph property P, we are given as input a graph G and we want to design an algorithm (called *tester*) to distinguish the case that G has property P from the case that G is "far from" the property P. Here, the notion of being "far from" is parameterized by a distance parameter ϵ. In most situations, a graph G is said to be ϵ-far from property P if one has to modify at least an ϵ fraction of edges of G to obtain a graph G' with property P. Typically, given oracle access to the input graph G, we want to design a property tester that only queries a small portion of G, which often leads to sublinear time algorithms.

In the last fifteen years, many testers have been developed for different graph properties, such as k-colorability, bipartiteness, acyclicity, triangle-freeness and many others (see the survey [Gol10]). Most of these testers apply only to the adjacency matrix model or the adjacency list model, depending on the types of queries the testers are allowed to perform to the oracle. The former model is most suitable for *dense* graphs and general characterizations on the testability of a property in this model has been given (e.g., [AFNS09]). The latter model is most suitable for *sparse* graphs, and several property testers using the techniques of local search or random walks are known, while it is not well understood what properties are testable in constant in this model. Even less is known about testers or testability results for general graphs. Existing property testing algorithms in this model usually resort to reductions that substitute high degree vertices with expanders or transform the graph into a bound degree graph, on which the testers are already known or can be easily designed (e.g., [KKR04, LPP11]).

---

[*] State Key Laboratory of Computer Science, Institute of Software, Chinese Academy of Sciences, email: angsheng@ios.ac.cn

[†] State Key Laboratory of Computer Science, Institute of Software, Chinese Academy of Sciences, email: pengpan@ios.ac.cn

In this paper, we consider the problem of testing *small set expansion* and give a tester using recent new analysis techniques of lazy random walks in the design of local graph partitioning algorithms and do *not* reduce our problem to other classes of graphs. Given a graph $G = (V, E)$ with n vertices and m edges, and a set $S \subseteq V$, let the *volume* of S be the sum of degree of vertices in S, that is, $\text{vol}(S) := \sum_{v \in S} d(v)$, where $d(v)$ denotes the degree of vertex v. Define the *conductance* of S as $\phi(S) := \frac{e(S,\bar{S})}{\text{vol}(S)}$, where $e(S, \bar{S})$ is the number of edges leaving S; and define the *expansion profile* of G as $\phi(k) := \min_{S:\text{vol}(S) \leq k} \phi(S)$. A graph G is called a (k, ϕ)-expander if $\phi(k) \geq \phi$, that is, all the subsets in G with volume at most k have conductance at least ϕ. We will refer to small set expander as (k, ϕ)-expander and refer to small set expansion as $\phi(k)$ for k much smaller than $\text{vol}(V)/2 = m$.

Besides of the relation to the mixing time of random walks [LK99], small set expansion has been of much interest recently for its close connection to the unique games conjecture [RS10, ABS10], and the design of local graph partitioning algorithms in massive graphs [ST08, ACL06, AP09, OT12, KL12]. Approximation algorithms and spectral characterizations for the small set expansion problem have been studied [ABS10, LRTV12, LOT12, KL12, OT12, OW12]. It is natural to ask if one can efficiently (in sublinear time) test if a graph is a small set expander.

We give a tester for small set expansion in a model for the general graphs. The model assumes access to the graph by an oracle, which allows both *degree queries* and *neighbor queries* that query the degree and the i-th neighbor of some vertex, respectively. We use the common definition of distance between graphs. More precisely, a graph G with m edges is said to be ϵ-far from a (k, ϕ)-expander if one has to modify at least ϵm edges of G so that it becomes a (k, ϕ)-expander. We will assume that ϵ is a sufficiently small constant. We present our small set expansion testing algorithm called `SSETester` in Section 3. Our main result of the tester is the following theorem.

Theorem 1 (Main)**.** *Given as input an n-vertex graph, a volume bound k, a conductance bound ϕ, and a distance parameter ϵ, the algorithm `SSETester` accepts any graph that is a (k, ϕ)-expander, and rejects with high probability*[1] *any graph that is ϵ-far from any (k^*, ϕ^*)-expander, where $k^* = O(k^{1-\xi})$ and $\phi^* = O(\xi\phi^2)$ for any $0 < \xi < 1/2$. Furthermore, whenever it rejects a graph, it provides a certificate that the graph is not a (k, ϕ)-expander in the form of a set of volume at most k and expansion at most ϕ. The running time of the algorithm is $O(\frac{k \ln^5 k}{\epsilon \phi^6})$.*

Note that our testing algorithm has *one-sided error*, which means that the tester always accepts every (k, ϕ)-expander, and it runs in time sublinear in n for $k = O(\frac{n}{\log^{\Omega(1)} n})$.

1.1 Our Techniques

As aforementioned, we will adopt recent new analysis techniques for *lazy random walks* in the design of local graph partitioning algorithms instead of trying to reduce the problem to testing small set expansion in other classes of graphs. We first perform multiple random walks on the input graph G from some randomly chosen vertex v and show that we can get empirical distributions that approximate well the true probability distributions of lazy random walks of length t. Then by using similar arguments for local graph partitioning algorithms, we can prove that if the start vertex v is "weak" in some sense, then a *sweep process* over the empirical distributions can find a small set with small expansion. Finally, we show that if the input graph is far from any small set expander, then there are at least a constant fraction (measured in volume) of weak vertices, so that with high probability, we will sample out a weak vertex and thus find a small non-expanding set. In the proof of the final part, we show that if there are few weak vertices, then we can modify at most ϵm edges of G to get a small set expander by a known patch-up algorithm, which has been used in the analysis of the expansion testers.

---

[1] "with high probability" means with probability at least $2/3$.

1.2 Related Works

There is an interesting line of research on testing the special case of the (k, ϕ)-expander for $k = m$, which is often abbreviated as ϕ-*expander*. (And $\phi(m)$ is often abbreviated as the *expansion (or conductance)* of G [HLW06].) Goldreich and Ron [GR02] have proposed an expansion tester for bounded degree graphs. The tester (with different setting parameters) has later been analyzed by Czumaj and Sohler [CS07], Nachmias and Shapira [NS10], and Kale and Seshadhri [KS11b], and it is proven that the tester can distinguish d-regular ϕ-expanders from graphs that are ϵ-far from any d-regular $\Omega(\phi^2)$-expanders. The running time of the tester is $O(n^{0.5+\eta}(\epsilon^{-1}\log n)^{\Omega(1)})$ for any $\eta > 0$, which is almost optimal. Li, Pan and Peng [LPP11] give an expansion tester for general graphs that matches the best known tester for bounded degree graphs. We note that our tester is *not* a sublinear expansion tester for the general graphs, since our algorithm try to find a set with small conductance and it will take time at least proportional to the volume of output set. Especially, when the volume parameter $k = m$, it runs in time $O(m \log^6 m)$.

The techniques of random walks have also been used to test bipartiteness under different models [KKR04, CMOS11]. The idea of using multiple random walks on graphs to estimate the true probability distribution of random walks of length t and then to find sparse cuts has been used by Kale and Seshadhri [KS11a] and Das Sarma, Gollapudi and Panigrahy [DGP09] in the design of local graph algorithms and graph stream models, respectively.

1.3 Organization

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we give some basic definitions and introduce the tool of random walks. Then we present our tester and bound its running time in Section 3. We give the proof of the *soundness* of the tester and thus complete the proof of the main theorem in Section 4. In Section 5, we discuss some concluding remarks and open problems.

2 Preliminaries

Let $G = (V, E)$ be an undirected graph with n vertices and m vertices. Let $d(v)$ denote the degree of a vertex v. We assume that we can access to the graph G by an oracle which allows both the *degree queries* and *neighbor queries*, that is, for any vertex v, one can query in constant time the degree of v and the i-th neighbor of v.

For a vertex subset $S \subseteq V$, let $e(S, V \backslash S)$ be the number of edges leaving S. Let $\text{vol}(S) := \sum_{v \in S} d(v)$ and $\phi(S) := e(S, \bar{S})/\text{vol}(S)$ be the *volume* of S and the *conductance* of S, respectively. Note that $\text{vol}(G) := \text{vol}(V) = 2m$. Define the *expansion profile of* G as $\phi(k) := \min_{S:\text{vol}(S) \leq k} \phi(S)$. In particular, $\phi(m)$ is often referred to the *conductance (or expansion) of* G.

Definition 1. *A graph G is a (k, ϕ)-expander if $\phi(k) \geq \phi$. Equivalently, G is a (k, ϕ)-expander if for every $S \subseteq V$ with volume vol$(S) \leq k$ has conductance $\phi(S) \geq \phi$.*

We have the following definition of graphs that are ϵ-far from (k, ϕ)-expanders.

Definition 2. *A graph G is ϵ-far from a (k, ϕ)-expander if one has to modify at least ϵm edges of G to obtain a (k, ϕ)-expander.*

The main tool in our algorithm and analysis is the *lazy random walk* on G. In a lazy random walk, if we are currently at vertex v, then in the next step, we choose a random neighbor u with probability $1/2d(v)$ and move to u. With the remaining probability $1/2$, we stay at v. Let A, D denote the adjacency matrix and diagonal degree matrix of G, respectively. Then $W := (I + D^{-1}A)/2$ is probability transition matrix of the lazy random walk of G, where I is the identity matrix.

We will use bold letters to denote row vectors. Let $\mathbf{p}_0$ be an initial probability distribution on vertices. The probability distribution after t steps of lazy random walks is defined as $\mathbf{p}_t = \mathbf{p}_0 W^t$. Let $\mathbf{1}_v$ denote the indicator vector on vertex v. For any vector $\mathbf{p}$, let $\mathbf{p}(S) := \sum_{v \in S} \mathbf{p}(v)$. Recently, Oveis Gharan and Trevisan proved the following lemma to bound the escaping probability of random walks.

Lemma 1 ([OT12]). *For any set $S \subseteq V$ and integer $t > 0$, there exists $S^t \subseteq S$ such that $vol(S^t) \geq vol(S)/2$ and for any $v \in S^t$, $\boldsymbol{p}_t := \boldsymbol{1}_v W^t$, we have $\boldsymbol{p}_t(S) \geq c_1(1 - \frac{3\phi(S)}{2})^t$ for some constant $c_1 > 0$.*

Lovász and Simonovits [LS90, LS93] introduced the following potential function to analyze random walks, which has been widely used to design local graph partitioning algorithms [ST08, ACL06, AP09, OT12, KL12].

For any vector $\mathbf{p}$ and $0 \leq x \leq 2m$, let $I(\mathbf{p}, x) := \max_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{D}_x} \sum_{v \in V} \mathbf{p}(v)\mathbf{w}(v)$, where $\mathcal{D}_x = \{\mathbf{w} | \mathbf{w} \in [0,1]^n, \mathbf{w}(v)d(v) = x\}$. Note that if we order the vertices so that $\frac{\mathbf{p}(v_1)}{d(v_1)} \geq \frac{\mathbf{p}(v_2)}{d(v_2)} \cdots \geq \frac{\mathbf{p}(v_n)}{d(v_n)}$, and let $S_i(\mathbf{p}) := \{v_1, \cdots, v_i\}$ denote the *sweep set* of the first i vertices and let $x_i := \mathrm{vol}(S_i)$, then $I(\mathbf{p}, x_i) = \sum_{v \in S_i(p)} \mathbf{p}(v) = \mathbf{p}(S_i(\mathbf{p}))$. For other x values such that $x_{i-1} \leq x < x_i$, $I(\mathbf{p}, x) = I(\mathbf{p}, x_{i-1}) + \frac{\mathbf{p}(v_i)}{d(v_i)}(I(\mathbf{p}, x_i) - I(\mathbf{p}, x_{i-1}))$, that is, $I(\mathbf{p}, x)$ is a piecewise linear function of x. Furthermore, $I(\mathbf{p}, x)$ is a non-decreasing and concave function in x. Lovász and Simonovits proved the following lemma on the potential function.

Lemma 2 ([LS90, LS93]). *For any probability distribution $\boldsymbol{p}$ and any vertex set S with volume at most m, $\boldsymbol{p}W(S) \leq \frac{1}{2}(I(\boldsymbol{p}, vol(S)(1 + \phi(S))) + I(\boldsymbol{p}, vol(S)(1 - \phi(S))))$.*

3 The Small Set Expansion Tester

In this section, we present our property testing algorithm for small set expansion and provide the proof of the easy part of the main theorem.

```
SSETester($G, k, \phi, \epsilon$)
  1. Repeat $M = \Theta(1/\epsilon)$ times:
     (a) Pick a random vertex $v$ with probability proportional to its degree.
     (b) If Detector($G, v, k, \phi$) returns found then abort and output reject.
  2. In case no call to Detector returned found then output accept.
```

The subroutine `Detector` is defined as follows.

```
Detector($G, v, k, \phi$)
  1. Perform $N$ lazy random walk of length $T$ from $v$, where $N := 30T^2 k \ln k$ and $T := 8 \ln k/\phi^2$.
  2. For each length $t = 0, 1, 2, ..., T$:
     (a) Let $N(u)$ denote the number of walks of length $t$ that ends at vertex $u$. Order the vertices in decreasing order of the ratio of $N(u)/d(u)$, breaking ties arbitrarily.
     (b) Let $S_i$ be the first $i$ vertices in this ordering for any $1 \leq i \leq n$. Compute the conductance of each set $S_i$ with volume at most $k$.
     (c) If the conductance of any such set is less than $\phi$, then return found.
  3. Return not-found.
```

We want to show that `SSETester` has the performance guarantees as given in Theorem 1. The running time of the tester can be bounded as follows. In the subroutine `Detector`, for each $t \leq T$, the computation involves sorting vertices according to the ratio $N(u)/d(u)$, which takes time $O(N \log N)$ (since there are at most N vertices with nonzero $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_t$ values, we only need to sort these N vertices and order other vertices arbitrarily); and computing the conductance for each small sweep sets, which takes time $O(k)$, respectively. Therefore, each call to `Detector` takes time $O(T(N \log N + k)) = O(k \ln^5 k/\phi^6)$. The total time of the tester involves M calls to `Detector` and thus is $O(\frac{k \ln^5 k}{\epsilon \phi^6})$.

Now note that if G is a (k, ϕ)-expander, then there is no subset with volume at most k and conductance less than ϕ, and thus `Detector` will return **not-found** and `SSETester` will output **accept**. Therefore, to prove Theorem 1, it remains to prove the *soundness* of the tester, that is, to show that if G is ϵ-far from any (k^*, ϕ^*)-expander, then `SSETester` rejects G with probability at least $2/3$, where $k^* = O(k^{1-\xi})$ and $\phi^* = O(\xi\phi^2)$ for any $0 < \xi < 1/2$. In the remaining of the paper, we will assume ξ to be some fixed number less than $1/2$.

4 Proof of the Soundness of the Tester

Before we give the details of the proof of the remaining part of Theorem 1, we give a high level exposition of the ideas. Recent progress on local graph partitioning algorithms given by Oveis Gharan and Trevisan [OT12] (and independently Kwok and Lau[KL12]) shows that if the graph contains a subset S with volume at most k and conductance at most ϕ, then by choosing "proper" start vertex $v \in S$ and computing the conductance of all the sweep sets of $\mathbf{p}_t = \mathbf{1}_v W^t$ with volume at most $O(k^{1+\xi'})$ for any $0 < \xi' < 1/2$ and $t \leq T$, we are guaranteed that at least one such sweep set has conductance $O(\sqrt{\phi/\xi'})$, where T is a properly chosen parameter.

The above idea is used in the design and analysis of our tester. We show that if the input graph G is ϵ-far from any (k^*, ϕ^*)-expander, then there exists "many" such "proper" start vertices (called *weak* vertices) from which the random walk probability distributions can be used to find small non-expanding sets. The existence of "many" weak vertices ensures that we can sample out at least one weak vertex with high probability. We prove this fact by contradiction and show that if there are "few" weak vertices in G, then there exists a patch-up procedure that changes at most ϵm edges of G to get a (k^*, ϕ^*)-expander. The proof of this part is almost the same as the corresponding part in the expansion tester [KS11b, LPP11] and is given in Section 4.2.

One important caution here is that in order to design a sublinear time tester, we are not able to compute the exact probability distribution $\mathbf{p}_t$. Instead we perform multiple lazy random walks on the graph to obtain empirical distributions $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_t$, which can be computed by inspecting only a small portion of the graph. For any vertex u, $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_t(u)$ is the fraction of lazy random walks of length t that hit on u. We show that $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_t$ is a good estimation of $\mathbf{p}_t$, and the sweep sets of $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_t$ can also be used as candidate sets to find small sets of small expansion.

In the remaining of this section, we first prove that the empirical distribution $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_t$ is a good approximation to $\mathbf{p}_t$ for any $t \leq T$, and then give the definition of weak vertices for which `Detector` returns **found**. After that we show that if G is ϵ-far from any (k^*, ϕ^*)-expander, then the set of weak vertices has volume at least $\Omega(\epsilon m)$, which is large enough to ensure our tester sampling out at least one weak vertex and thus rejecting the graph.

4.1 Analysis of the Random Walks in `Detector`

Assume that the random walks in `Detector` start from some vertex v. For each $t \leq T = 8 \ln k/\phi^2$, define the empirical distribution in the `Detector` as $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_t(u) := N(u)/N$, where $N(u)$ is the number of walks of length t that end at u and $N = 30T^2 k \ln k$ is the total number of random walks. Note that S_i in step (2b) of the subroutine `Detector` is the sweep set of the first i vertices of $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_t$. We first show that $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_t$ is a good approximation to the exact probability distribution $\mathbf{p}_t = \mathbf{1}_v W^t$.

Lemma 3. *For any vertex u and $t \leq T$, with probability at least $1 - k^{-10}$,*

$$|\tilde{\boldsymbol{p}}_t(u) - \boldsymbol{p}_t(u)| \leq \lambda_u := \frac{1}{T}(\boldsymbol{p}_t(u) + k^{-1}). \tag{1}$$

Furthermore, for any $x \leq k$, with probability at least $1 - k^{-8}$,

$$(1 - \frac{1}{T})I(\boldsymbol{p}_t, x) - \frac{x}{kT} \leq I(\tilde{\boldsymbol{p}}_t, x) \leq (1 + \frac{1}{T})I(\boldsymbol{p}_t, x) + \frac{x}{kT}. \tag{2}$$

Proof. By the fact that $\mathrm{E}[\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_t(u)] = \mathbf{p}_t(u)$ and the Bernstein's inequality, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\Pr[|\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_t(u) - \mathbf{p}_t(u)| \le \lambda_u] &\le 2\exp\Big(-\frac{N\lambda_u^2}{2(\mathbf{p}_t(u) + \lambda_u/3)}\Big) \\ &\le 2\exp\Big(-\frac{30k\ln k(\mathbf{p}_t(u) + k^{-1})^2}{3(\mathbf{p}_t(u) + k^{-1})}\Big) \le 1/k^{10}\end{aligned}$$

Now let $\mathcal{E}$ denote the event that inequality (1) holds for all vertices in the sweep sets $S_i(\mathbf{p}_t)$ and $S_i(\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_t)$ of volume at most k and we will condition event $\mathcal{E}$, which occurs with probability at least $1 - k^{-8}$. Let $x_i = \mathrm{vol}(S_i(\mathbf{p}_t))$ and $\tilde{x}_i = \mathrm{vol}(S_i(\mathbf{p}_t))$. Then by the definition and properties of the potential function, we have that

$$I(\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_t, x_i) \ge \tilde{\mathbf{p}}_t(S_i(\mathbf{p}_t)) \ge (1 - \frac{1}{T})\mathbf{p}_t(S_i(\mathbf{p}_t)) - \frac{i}{kT} \ge (1 - \frac{1}{T})I(\mathbf{p}_t, x_i) - \frac{x_i}{kT}$$

and that

$$I(\mathbf{p}_t, \tilde{x}_i) \ge \mathbf{p}_t(S_i(\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_t)) \ge \frac{1}{1 + 1/T}(\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_t(S_i(\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_t)) - \frac{i}{kT}) \ge \frac{1}{1 + 1/T}(I(\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_t, \tilde{x}_i) - \frac{\tilde{x}_i}{kT}).$$

Finally inequality (2) follows immediately from the fact that both $I(\mathbf{p}_t, x)$ and $I(\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_t, x)$ are piecewise linear, concave and non-decreasing. ☐

Let $\mathbf{p}_t$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_t$ be as defined above. We now give an upper bound on $I(\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_t, x)$ when all the small sweep sets are expanding.

Lemma 4. *If for all $t \le T$, the sweep sets $S_i(\tilde{\boldsymbol{p}}_t)$ of volume at most k has conductance at least ϕ, then with probability at least $1 - k^{-8}$, for any $x \le 2m$,*

$$I(\tilde{\boldsymbol{p}}_t, x) \le e^{3t/T}\Big(\frac{x}{k} + \sqrt{x/d(v)}\Big(1 - \frac{\phi^2}{8}\Big)^t\Big) + 3e^{4t/T}\frac{x}{k}. \tag{3}$$

Proof. Assume the event $\mathcal{E}$ in the proof of Lemma 3 holds, which occurs with probability at least $1 - k^{-8}$. Thus inequality (2) also holds. Let $\tilde{x}_i = \mathrm{vol}(S_i(\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_t)) \le k$. Since $S_i(\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_t)$ has conductance at least ϕ,

$$\begin{aligned}I(\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_t, \tilde{x}_i) = \tilde{\mathbf{p}}_t(S_i(\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_t)) &\le (1 + \frac{1}{T})\mathbf{p}_t(S_i(\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_t)) + \frac{\tilde{x}_i}{kT} \\ &\le \frac{1 + 1/T}{2}(I(\mathbf{p}_{t-1}, \tilde{x}_i(1 + \phi)) + I(\mathbf{p}_{t-1}, \tilde{x}_i(1 - \phi))) + \frac{\tilde{x}_i}{kT} \\ &\le \frac{1 + 1/T}{2(1 - 1/T)}(I(\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_{t-1}, \tilde{x}_i(1 + \phi)) + I(\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_{t-1}, \tilde{x}_i(1 - \phi)) + \frac{2\tilde{x}_i}{kT}) + \frac{\tilde{x}_i}{kT} \\ &\le \frac{e^{3/T}}{2}(I(\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_{t-1}, \tilde{x}_i(1 + \phi)) + I(\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_{t-1}, \tilde{x}_i(1 - \phi))) + \frac{3\tilde{x}_i}{kT}, \qquad (4)\end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality follows our assumption, the second inequality follows from Lemma 2, the last two inequalities follow from inequality 2 and the fact that $\frac{1+1/T}{1-1/T} \le \min\{2, e^{3/T}\}$, respectively.

Now we show by induction on t that the statement of lemma holds. For $t = 0$, the inequality (3) holds trivially since the LHS is at most $\min\{1, x/d(v)\}$ and the RHS is at least $\sqrt{x/d(v)}$. Now assume the lemma holds for $t - 1$. Since $I(\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_t, x)$ is a piecewise linear function of x, and the RHS is a concave function, it is suffices to prove the statement for values of $\tilde{x}_i = \mathrm{vol}(S_i(\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_t))$. If $\tilde{x}_i > k$, the statement holds since the RHS is at least 1, which is an upper bound for the LHS. Now assume $\tilde{x}_i \le k$. By inequality (4), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
I(\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_t, \tilde{x}_i) &\le \frac{e^{3/T}}{2}\left(I(\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_{t-1}, \tilde{x}_i(1+\phi)) + I(\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_{t-1}, \tilde{x}_i(1-\phi))\right) + \frac{3\tilde{x}_i}{kT} \\
&\le \frac{e^{3/T}}{2}\Big[e^{3(t-1)/T}\Big(\frac{2\tilde{x}_i}{k} + \sqrt{\tilde{x}_i/d(v)}\Big(1-\frac{\phi^2}{8}\Big)^{t-1}(\sqrt{1+\phi}+\sqrt{1-\phi})\Big) \\
&\qquad +6e^{4(t-1)/T}\frac{\tilde{x}_i}{k}\Big] + \frac{3\tilde{x}_i}{kT} \\
&\le e^{3t/T}\Big(\frac{\tilde{x}_i}{k} + \sqrt{\tilde{x}_i/d(v)}\Big(1-\frac{\phi^2}{8}\Big)^{t}\Big) + (3e^{3/T}e^{4(t-1)/T} + 3/T)\frac{\tilde{x}_i}{k} \\
&\le e^{3t/T}\Big(\frac{\tilde{x}_i}{k} + \sqrt{\tilde{x}_i/d(v)}(1-\frac{\phi^2}{8})^{t}\Big) + 3e^{4t/T}\frac{\tilde{x}_i}{k},
\end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from induction, the third inequality follows from the fact that $\sqrt{1+\phi}+\sqrt{1-\phi} \le 2 - \frac{\phi^2}{4}$ for any $\phi \le 1$. ☐

Now we give the definition of weak vertices and show that if the lazy random walks in `Detector` start from some weak vertex, then `Detector` will find a small non-expanding set. Let $k^* := ck^{1-\xi}$ for some constant c to be specified later.

Definition 3. *A vertex v is weak if $I(\mathbf{1}_v W^T, k^*) \ge c_1 k^{-\xi}$, where c_1 is the constant in Lemma 1.*

We have the following lemma.

Lemma 5. *If v is weak, then with probability at least $1-k^{-8}$, `Detector`(G, v, k, ϕ) finds a set of volume at most k and conductance ϕ and thus returns **found**.*

Proof. We will condition on the event $\mathcal{E}$ in Lemma 3 that occurs with probability at least $1-k^{-8}$. Let $\mathbf{p}_t := \mathbf{1}_v W^t$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_t$ be the corresponding empirical distribution of the lazy random walk of length t starting from v. By the fact that v is weak and Lemma 3,

$$I(\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_T, k^*) \ge (1-\frac{1}{T})I(\mathbf{p}_T, k^*) - \frac{k^*}{kT} > 0.99c_1k^{-\xi} \qquad \text{(for } k \text{ larger than some constant)}$$

Now assume that the subroutine `Detector`(G, v, k, ϕ) does not find a set of volume at most k and conductance at most ϕ, that is, all the sweep sets $S_i(\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_t)$ of volume at most k have conductance at least ϕ, then by Lemma 4,

$$\begin{aligned}
I(\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_T, k^*) &\le e^3\Big(\frac{k^*}{k} + \sqrt{k^*}\Big(1-\frac{\phi^2}{8}\Big)^T\Big) + 3e^4\frac{k^*}{k} \\
&\le c_2\Big(\frac{k^*}{k} + \sqrt{k^*}\Big(1-\frac{\phi^2}{8}\Big)^T\Big) \qquad \text{(for constant } c_2 \ge e^3+3e^4\text{)} \\
&\le c_2\Big(\frac{c_1k^{-\xi}}{3c_2} + k^{1/2}\Big(1-\frac{\phi^2}{8}\Big)^{\frac{8\ln k}{\phi^2}}\Big) \qquad \Big(\text{for } k^* = ck^{1-\xi} \text{ and } c := \frac{c_1}{3c_2}\Big) \\
&\le 0.99c_1k^{-\xi}, \qquad \text{(for } \xi < 1/2 \text{ and } k \text{ larger than some constant)}
\end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction. ☐

4.2 The Existence of “Many” Weak Vertices

Finally, we show that if G is far from any small set expander, then G contains a large set of weak vertices that has a constant fraction of volume of G. More precisely, we have the following theorem.

Theorem 2. *If $G=(V,E)$ is ϵ-far from any (k^*, ϕ^*)-expander, then the set of weak vertices has volume $\Omega(\epsilon m)$.*

Before we prove this theorem, we show how it can be used to prove the soundness of the tester and thus complete the proof of the main theorem.

Proof of Theorem 1. By Theorem 2, we know that if G is ϵ-far from any (k^*, ϕ^*)-expander, then with probability at least $5/6$ (on the randomness in the sampling), the tester `SSETester` will sample out a weak vertex since it picks a vertex with probability proportional to its degree, which means that at each time a weak vertex is chosen with probability $\Omega(\epsilon)$, and the number of samples is $\Theta(1/\epsilon)$. Once a weak vertex is sampled out, we know that with probability at leat $1 - k^{-8}$ (on the randomness in the random walks), the subroutine `Detector` will find a small non-expanding set and return **found**, for which `SSETester` will reject the graph. Therefore, the probability that the tester outputs **reject** is at least $2/3$. This completes the proof. □

Now we devote to prove Theorem 2, for which we prove by contradiction. That is, we show that if the volume of the set of weak vertices is small, then G is *not* ϵ-far from (k^*, ϕ^*)-expander. The proof is composed of the following two lemmas. The first one (Lemma 6) shows that if there are few weak vertices, then there is a "good" partition of G. The second one (Lemma 7) shows that the "good" partition can be used by a *patch-up* algorithm that modifies a small fraction of edges of G and gets a small set expander. This part of the proof is very similar to the corresponding part of testing expansion [KS11b, LPP11].

We first introduce some notations. For $S \subseteq U \subseteq V$, let $\text{vol}_U(S)$ and $\phi_U(S)$ be the volume and conductance of S in the subgraph of G induced by vertices in U. We will omit the subscript when $U = V$. Now we are ready to give our lemmas.

Lemma 6. *Given a graph $G = (V, E)$, if the volume of set of weak vertices is at most $\frac{\epsilon m}{5}$, then there exists a partition of V, written as $V = A_1 \cup \cdots \cup A_s \cup B$, where $A_1, \cdots, A_s, B$ are mutually disjoint, satisfying that vol$(A_1 \cup \cdots \cup A_s) \leq \frac{2\epsilon m}{5}$ and for any $i \leq s$, vol$(A_i) \leq k^*$ and $\phi(A_i) \leq \Phi := \frac{\xi\phi^2}{24}$. Furthermore, the induced subgraph on vertex set B is a (k^*, Φ)-expander.*

Proof. Let A_0 be the empty set and let $V_0 := V$. For each $i \geq 1$, if there is a subset $A_i \subseteq V_{i-1}$ such that $\text{vol}(A_i) \leq k^*$ and $\phi_{V_{i-1}}(A_i) < \Phi$, then we remove A_i from V_{i-1} and let $V_i := V_{i-1} \backslash A_i$. We repeat this process no such subset exists. Assume that the last set we removed is A_s. Then by construction, we know that the induced subgraph on $B := V_s = V \backslash (A_1 \cup \cdots \cup A_s)$ is a (k^*, Φ)-expander.

Noting that

$$e(A_i, V \backslash A_i) = e(A_i, V_{i-1} \backslash A_i) + e(A_i, A_1 \cup \cdots \cup A_{i-1}),$$

and that

$$\text{vol}(A_i) = \text{vol}_{V_{i-1}}(A_i) + e(A_i, A_1 \cup \cdots \cup A_{i-1}),$$

we have

$$\phi(A_i) \leq \phi_{V_{i-1}}(A_i) = e(A_i, V_{i-1} \backslash A_i)/\text{vol}_{V_{i-1}}(A_i) \leq \Phi.$$

Now by Lemma 1, for each A_i such that $1 \leq i \leq s$, there exists a large subset $C_i \subseteq A_i$ such that $\text{vol}(C_i) \geq \text{vol}(A_i)/2$ and, for any $v \in C_i$,

$$I(\mathbf{1}_v W^T, k^*) \geq \mathbf{1}_v W^T(A_i) \geq c_1 (1 - \frac{3\Phi}{2})^T = c_1 (1 - \frac{\xi\phi^2}{16})^{\frac{8 \ln k}{\phi^2}} \geq c_1 k^{-\xi},$$

which means that v is weak.

Now assume that $\text{vol}(A_1 \cup \cdots \cup A_s) > \frac{2\epsilon m}{5}$, then the volume of the set of weak vertices is at least $(\text{vol}(C_1) + \cdots + \text{vol}(C_s))/2 > \frac{\epsilon m}{5}$, which is a contradiction. This completes the proof. □

Now let $\phi^* = c'\xi\phi^2$ for some constant c' to be specified later.

Lemma 7. *If a graph G has a partition as in Lemma 6, then we can modify at most ϵm edges of G to obtain a (k^*, ϕ^*)-expander.*

The proof uses the following patch-up algorithm.

```
Patch-Up($G$)
  1. Partition $G$ into $A_1, \cdots, A_s, B$ as in Lemma 6.
  2. Remove all the edges incident to some vertex in $A_i$ for all $i \leq s$.
  3. For any $i \leq s$ and each vertex $u \in A_i$, repeat the following process until its degree
     becomes $d(u)$ or $d(u) - 1$:
     (a) Choose a vertex $v \in B$ with probability $d(v)/\mathrm{vol}(B)$.
     (b) If the current degree of $v$ is less than $d(v)$, then add an edge between $u$ and $v$.
     (c) Otherwise, if there is an edge $(v, w)$ such that $w \in B$, then delete edge $(v, w)$ and
         add edges $(u, v)$ and $(u, w)$.
     (d) Otherwise, resample the vertex $v \in B$.
```

Proof Sketch of Lemma 7. Li, Pan and Peng [LPP11] ensured the termination of step (3) in the algorithm `Patch-Up` in that every vertex v in A_i will reach degree $d(v)$ or $d(v) - 1$, and showed that the number of edges modified during the whole process is at most ϵm. Furthermore, they proved that if the vertex subset B in the partition is a Φ-expander, then the final graph is a $c_3\Phi$-expander for some constant c_3.

Thus, to prove Lemma 7, we only need to show that if the subset B is a (k^*, Φ)-expander (as guaranteed by Lemma 6), then the final graph is also a $(k^*, c_3\Phi)$-expander. This follows directly by applying the arguments in [LPP11] for studying the conductance of all subsets of volume at most m to studying the the conductance of all subsets of volume at k^*. Finally, we set $c' := \frac{c_3}{24}$ so that the final graph is a (k^*, ϕ^*)-expander. ☐

Proof of Theorem 2. The proof follows directly from Lemma 6 and Lemma 7. ☐

5 Conclusions

We use the analysis of lazy random walks from the local graph partitioning algorithms to give a one-sided small set expansion tester `SSETester` for general graphs. The tester distinguishes (k, ϕ)-expanders and graphs that are ϵ-far from (k^*, ϕ^*)-expanders where $k^* = \Theta(k^{1-\xi})$ and $\phi^* = \Theta(\xi\phi^2)$ for any $\xi < 1/2$. The running time of `SSETester` is slightly super linear in k and is sublinear in n only when $k = O(\frac{n}{\log^{\Omega(1)} n})$. In particular, the tester can not be served as an expansion tester, since when $k = m$, the running time our tester is suplinear in n. It will be very interesting to design a tester with running time sublinear in k. A more challenging problem is to reduce the gap in both the volume and conductance of our tester, with the goal of finding a tester that can distinguish (k, ϕ)-expanders from graphs that are ϵ-far from (k, ϕ)-expanders.

Acknowledgements.

The research is partially supported by NSFC distinguished young investigator award number 60325206, and its matching fund from the Hundred-Talent Program of the Chinese Academy of Sciences. Both authors are partially supported by the Grand Project "Network Algorithms and Digital Information" of the Institute of software, Chinese Academy of Sciences.

References

[AFNS09] N. Alon, E. Fischer, I. Newman, and A. Shapira. A combinatorial characterization of the testable graph properties: it's all about regularity. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 39(1):143–167, 2009.

[ACL06] R. Andersen, F. Chung, and K. Lang. Local graph partitioning using pagerank vectors. In *Proceedings of the 47th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 475–486, Washington, DC, USA, 2006. IEEE Computer Society.

[AP09] R. Andersen and Y. Peres. Finding sparse cuts locally using evolving sets. In *Proceedings of the 41st annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, STOC '09, pages 235–244, New York, NY, USA, 2009. ACM.

[ABS10] S. Arora, B. Barak, and D. Steurer. Subexponential algorithms for unique games and related problems. In *Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS), 2010 51st Annual IEEE Symposium on*, pages 563–572. IEEE, 2010.

[CMOS11] A. Czumaj, M. Monemizadeh, K. Onak, and C. Sohler. Planar graphs: Random walks and bipartiteness testing. In *Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS), 2011 IEEE 52nd Annual Symposium on*, pages 423–432. IEEE, 2011.

[CS07] A. Czumaj and C. Sohler. Testing expansion in bounded-degree graphs. In *Foundations of Computer Science, 2007. FOCS'07. 48th Annual IEEE Symposium on*, pages 570–578. IEEE, 2007.

[DGP09] A. Das Sarma, S. Gollapudi, and R. Panigrahy. Sparse cut projections in graph streams. *Algorithms-ESA 2009*, pages 480–491, 2009.

[Gol10] O. Goldreich. *Property testing: current research and surveys*, volume 6390. Springer-Verlag New York Inc, 2010.

[GR02] O. Goldreich and D. Ron. Property testing in bounded degree graphs. *Algorithmica*, 32(2):302–343, 2002.

[HLW06] S. Hoory, N. Linial, and A. Wigderson. Expander graphs and their applications. *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society*, 43(4):439–561, 2006.

[KS11a] S. Kale and C. Seshadhri. Combinatorial approximation algorithms for maxcut using random walks. In 2nd Symposium on Innovations in Computer Science (ICS 2011), 2011.

[KS11b] S. Kale and C. Seshadhri. An expansion tester for bounded degree graphs. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 40(3):709–720, 2011.

[KKR04] T. Kaufman, M. Krivelevich, and D. Ron. Tight bounds for testing bipartiteness in general graphs. *SIAM Journal on computing*, 33(6):1441–1483, 2004.

[KL12] T.C. Kwok and L.C. Lau. Finding small sparse cuts locally by random walk. *Arxiv preprint arXiv:1204.4666*, 2012.

[LOT12] J.R. Lee, S. Oveis Gharan, and L. Trevisan. Multi-way spectral partitioning and higher-order cheeger inequalities. *Proceedings of the 44th annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, 2012.

[LPP11] A. Li, Y. Pan, and P. Peng. Testing conductance in general graphs. In *Electronic Colloquium on Computational Complexity (ECCC)*, volume 18, page 101, 2011.

[LRTV12] A. Louis, P. Raghavendra, P. Tetali, and S. Vempala. Many sparse cuts via higher eigenvalues. *Proceedings of the 44th annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, 2012.

[LK99] L. Lovász and R. Kannan. Faster mixing via average conductance. In *Proceedings of the thirty-first annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 282–287. ACM, 1999.

[LS90] L. Lovász and M. Simonovits. The mixing rate of markov chains, an isoperimetric inequality, and computing the volume. In *Foundations of Computer Science, 1990. Proceedings., 31st Annual Symposium on*, pages 346–354. IEEE, 1990.

[LS93] L. Lovász and M. Simonovits. Random walks in a convex body and an improved volume algorithm. *Random structures & algorithms*, 4(4):359–412, 1993.

[NS10] A. Nachmias and A. Shapira. Testing the expansion of a graph. *Information and Computation*, 208(4):309–314, 2010.

[OW12] R. O'Donnell and D. Witmer. Improved small-set expansion from higher eigenvalues. *Arxiv preprint arXiv:1204.4688*, 2012.

[OT12] S. Oveis Gharan and L. Trevisan. Approximating the expansion profile and almost optimal local graph clustering. In *53rd Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, FOCS '12, 2012.

[RS10] P. Raghavendra and D. Steurer. Graph expansion and the unique games conjecture. In *Proceedings of the 42nd ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 755–764. ACM, 2010.

[ST08] D.A. Spielman and S.H. Teng. A local clustering algorithm for massive graphs and its application to nearly-linear time graph partitioning. *Arxiv preprint arXiv:0809.3232*, 2008.